



**National Commission  
on Libraries and Information Science**

28 January 1981

TO : NCLIS Members

FROM : *Toni Carbo Bearman*  
Toni Carbo Bearman  
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Formal Motions and Actions, December 11-13, 1980 Meeting  
(REVISED)

Enclosed are the Formal Motions and Actions of the NCLIS Meeting held December 11-13, 1981. There were two reasons for revising the motions. They were: (1) to clarify the motion made by the Legislative/Public Awareness Committee; and (2) to add the words, "between the December 1980 and April 1981 meetings of the Commission," in motion #7.

Enclosure

FORMAL MOTIONS AND ACTIONS

December 11-13, 1980

- (1) It was MOVED by Margaret Warden, seconded by Clara Jones, that the Minutes of the September 18-19, 1980, meeting be approved as submitted. Passed unanimously, with Mr. Ambach not present.
- (2) The Chairman requested, and the Members agreed by consensus, to the membership of the following Standing Committees: Finances/Fund Raising, Bessie Moore, Frances Naftalin, and Philip Sprague (Chair); Legislative/Public Awareness, Gordon Ambach, Joan Gross, Paulette Holahan, Clara Jones, and Margaret Warden (Chair); Planning/Futures, Robert Burns, Francis Keppel, William Welsh, and Carlos Cuadra (Chair).
- (3) It was MOVED by Gordon Ambach, seconded by Robert Burns, Jr., that the Commission commit an additional amount, not to exceed \$15,000, to the Public/Private Sector Task Force, and that the staff be instructed to work with the Task Force on the procedures for holding two meetings at a minimum cost to the Commission. Passed unanimously.
- (4) The Legislative/Public Awareness Committee recommended, and MOVED:
  - (1) That the Commission be on record as intending to advance to the President and Congress in 1981, a National Library and Information Services Act. Such an Act would be based on, but not limited to, recommendations of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services and recommendations in other proposed acts as set forth in the compilation of Federal legislative proposals used at the WHCLIS Ad Hoc Committee meeting, September 15-17, 1980; and
  - (2). That to assist the Commission in preparing its proposed Act, the Commission would initiate a process to convene representatives of the appropriate national organizations and associations to:
    - (A) review the proposals in the document referred to in (1) above;
    - (B) identify those proposals having common support among the organizations and associations for inclusion in such an Act;
    - (C) identify those proposals which cause a division of support among the organizations and associations;
    - (D) establish priorities among the different proposals which might be included in such an Act; and
    - (E) attempt to develop a proposed Act which would be supported by the organizations, associations and Commission; and
  - (3) That the process under point (2) above commence immediately with planning for the first convention of representatives to occur as early as possible in January 1981; and,

---

\* For final wording of this motion, as approved, see pages 2-3.

- (4) That the procedures for implementation of points (1) and (2) above, including participation of Commission Members and the Legislative Committee and assignments to Commission staff, be prepared by the Commission staff and approved by the Chairman of the Commission after consultation with the Chair of the Legislative Committee; and,
- (5) That the target date for Commission action to advance such an Act to the President and the Congress be April 1981; and
- (6) That on completion of the steps in points (1) through (5) above, the Commission would join with the organizations and associations supporting the proposed Act to develop broad public awareness of the proposed Act and build support for enactment.

Other Proposed Legislative Committee Actions:

- (1) Review the "Brown" Bill re Information Institute re: (A) proposed changes in text; and (B) role for NCLIS
- (2) Re "Paperwork Legislation" - P.L. 96-511 - Assign task to staff and Committee re Advice to OMB re Statute
- (3) Recommend to Chairman of Commission that the Commission or other Committees of the Commission review and react to the "other" resolutions of the WHCLIS, just as the Legislative Committee proposes that the resolutions including Federal legislative proposals be reviewed in Commission action to advance a National Library and Information Services Act.

Several changes to this motion were suggested. The following represents the final wording:

- (1) That the Commission be on record as intending to advance to the President and Congress in 1981, specifications for legislation on library and information services. Such specifications would be based on, but not limited to, recommendations of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services and recommendations in other proposed acts as set forth in the compilation of Federal legislative proposals used at the White House Conference on Library and Information Services Ad Hoc Committee meeting, September 15-17, 1980; and
- (2) That to assist the Commission in preparing its proposed specifications, the Commission would initiate a process to convene representatives of the appropriate national organizations and associations to: (a) review the proposals in the document referred to in (1) above; (b) identify those proposals having common support among the organizations and associations for inclusion in such specifications; (c) identify those proposals

which cause a division of support among the organizations and associations; (d) establish priorities among the different proposals which might be included in such specifications; and (e) attempt to develop proposed specifications which would be supported by the organizations, associations, and Commission; and

- (3) That the process under point (2) above commence immediately with planning for the first convention of representatives to occur as early as possible; and,
- (4) That the procedures for implementation of points (1) and (2) above, including participation of Commission Members and the Legislative Committee and assignments to Commission staff, be prepared by the Commission staff and approved by the Chairman of the Commission after consultation with the Chair of the Legislative Committee; and,
- (5) That the target date for Commission action to advance such specifications to the President and the Congress be June 1981; and
- (6) That on completion of the steps in points (1) through (5) above, the Commission would join with the organizations and associations supporting the proposed specifications to develop broad public awareness of the proposed specifications and build support for enactment.

The Committee also proposed the following legislative actions:

- (1) Review the "Brown" Bill re Information Institute re (a) proposed changes in text; and (b) role for NCLIS;
  - (2) Re "Paperwork Legislation" - Public Law 91-511, assign task to staff and Committee re Advice to OMB re statute; and
  - (3) Recommend to Chairman of NCLIS that the Commission, or other Committees of the Commission, review and react to the "other" resolutions of the White House Conference, just as the Legislative Committee proposes that the formal legislative proposals be reviewed in Commission action to advance library and information service specifications.
- (5) It was MOVED by Helmut Alpers, seconded by Robert Burns, Jr., to table the motion proposed by the Legislative/Public Awareness Committee. In favor, five (5), opposed, eight (8).
  - (6) It was MOVED by Margaret Warden, seconded by Francis Keppel, that the Commission accept the resolution of the Legislative/Public Awareness Committee, as reworded. In favor, seven (7); opposed, six (6); abstained, one (1).

- (7) The Commission agreed that the Executive Committee and staff would have responsibility for prioritizing programs based on available NCLIS staff and funds between the December 1980 and April 1981 meetings of the Commission.
- (8) It was MOVED by Robert Burns, Jr., and severally seconded, that the Commission accept the reports, as presented by the committee and task force chairman, of the Committee of 118, the Role of the Special Library in a National Networking Program, and Cultural Minorities, and the three standing committees. Passed unanimously.



**National Commission  
on Libraries and Information Science**

ITEM (2)  
THURSDAY, APRIL 9, '81

**MINUTES**

December 12 and 13, 1980  
Washington, D.C.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Helmut Alpers; Gordon M. Ambach; Robert W. Burns, Jr.; Carlos A. Cuadra; Joan H. Gross; Paulette H. Holahan; Clara S. Jones; Francis Keppel; Bessie B. Moore; Frances H. Naftalin; Philip A. Sprague; Horace E. Tate; Margaret S. Warden; William J. Welsh; and Charles Benton, Presiding

**STAFF PRESENT :** Toni Carbo Bearman; Douglas S. Price; Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar; Ruby O. Woods-Robinson; Gerald J. Sophar; Carl C. Thompson; and Barbara Lee Whiteleather, Recording Secretary

**GUESTS/VISITORS:** Andrew A. Aines, Former NCLIS Member and Director, Office of Scientific and Technical Information, Department of Energy; Eileen Cooke, Director, American Library Association, Washington, D.C. Office; Marilyn Gell, Library Journal; Robert Frase, ANSC Z39; Robert Hayes, Chairman, Public/Private Sector Task Force, and Dean, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of California; Carol Johnson, ASIS Councillor; Karen Levitan, Chairman, Public-Private Interface, ASIS; Larry Robertson, National Telecommunications and Information Administration; Robert Willard, Information Industry Association; and Patricia Wolfe, Consultant

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Many of the Commissioners and staff attended a 7:30 a.m. Information Industry Association breakfast meeting at the Rayburn House Office Building.

The Chairman reviewed the agenda and the documents contained in the meeting packet.

### NCLIS Standing Committees

The Chairman requested, and the Members agreed, to the membership of the following Standing Committees: Finance/Fund Raising, Bessie Moore, Frances Naftalin, and Philip Sprague (Chair); Legislative/Public Awareness, Gordon Ambach, Joan Gross, Paulette Holahan, Clara Jones, Horace Tate, and Margaret Warden (Chair); Futures/Planning, Helmut Alpers, Robert Burns, Jr., Francis Keppel, William Welsh, and Carlos Cuadra (Chair). The Chairman of the Commission serves ex officio on all Standing Committees.

It was also noted that Bessie Moore serves as Chair of the Personnel Committee, with Charles Benton, Carlos Cuadra, Philip Sprague, Margaret Warden, and William Welsh serving as members.

### Approval of Minutes

It was MOVED by Margaret Warden, seconded by Clara Jones, that the Minutes of the September 18-19, 1980, Commission meeting be approved as submitted. Passed unanimously.

### Public-Private Interface

Dr. Karen B. Levitan, Chair, ASIS special interest group on "Public-Private Interface (PPI) was invited by the Chairman to inform the Members of a proposed symposium on information science and information policy. She explained that the intent of the spring symposium is: to build a "field" of study and practice--i.e., a body of literature, a cross-disciplinary community, and mechanisms for continuous exchange; to explore the range of substantive and methodological problems; to produce high quality articles and publish a special issue of the Policy Studies Journal; and to enhance recognition of information policy analysis as a unique and significant field of practice and study.

Dr. Levitan and Ms. Carol Johnson, ASIS Councillor, both stressed the need to look at and address information policy in a broad perspective and stated they are looking to working closely with Dr. Bearman.

### Public/Private Sector Task Force

The progress report of the Public/Private Sector Task Force entitled, "Public Sector/Private Sector Interaction in Providing Information Services" was presented to the Commission the previous evening by Dr. Robert Hayes, Chairman of the Task Force. The main purpose of the Report, Dr. Hayes explained, is to serve as a basis for NCLIS to consider whether there is sufficient progress to warrant continuation of the work of the task force. The task force, Dr. Hayes continued, did unanimously and vigorously express the view that it had made significant progress, that it has achieved a sense of common purpose. Further, that completion of its work would involve two more meetings--at least--if the work completed to date is not to be fruitless.

Mr. Burns suggested that definitions of information be included in the final report.

Mr. Welsh's statement that "this is the most significant product of the Commission" was agreed to by all Members.

The questions which need to be answered now, Mr. Benton stated, are: (1) What are the next steps? (2) What are the implications for the future? and (3) How can one test this theory with practice? Dr. Hayes' response to these questions was that he plans to establish subcommittees at the January 1981 meeting. Each subcommittee could focus on one or two of the illustrations cited in the Appendix to the report, or those which may come up as critical testing examples. The subcommittees could apply the principles to the specifics," Dr. Hayes said.

Mr. Burns asked, "How do you, Dr. Hayes, feel about sending copies of the preliminary report to reviewers for their comments?" Dr. Hayes stated that he would not have reservations, however, he saw this as a decision for the Commission. Mr. Benton stated that he would prefer that, at the end of the March 1981 meeting, a draft be produced which could be subject to external review and comment.

After an extensive open question and answer period:

It was MOVED by Gordon Ambach, seconded by Robert Burns, Jr., that the Commission commit an additional amount, not to exceed \$15,000, to the Public/Private Sector Task Force, and that the staff be instructed to work with the Task Force on the procedures for holding two meetings at a minimum cost to the Commission. Passed unanimously.

#### President's Message

In highlighting areas of specific concern to the Commission contained in the President's Message to Congress, Mr. Keppel cited:

- (1) Page 1, 4th paragraph - "Our First Amendment rights have been strengthened by the independent status of libraries free from government control."
- (2) Page 1, 5th paragraph. "Most libraries are local institutions, under local control. State and local governments bear the responsibility for supporting and operating public and school libraries. I agree with the White House Conference that this principle must be maintained."
- (3) Page 2, 4th paragraph. "I will submit new legislation to replace the Library Services and Construction Act which will expire in 1982."

The key point here, Mr. Keppel said, is that the LSCA will expire. This Commission must be prepared to respond to the Congress in 1982 on this issue.



- (4) Page 4, "New Information and Communications Technologies." The Commission may want to look closely to research and development; there may be follow through needed.
- (4) Page 3, "The Needs of the Disadvantaged."
- (5) Page 5, "The Department of Education will support a Conference of Independent Experts to develop an agenda for library research in the 1980's."

Dr. Cuadra informed the Members that his Company (Cuadra Associates) has been awarded this contract (awarded on a competitive basis in response to a Request for Proposal). The intent is to define the research needs in library and information science for the decade of the 1980's using this conference of independent experts as one of the mechanisms for getting that done. The conference will probably be held in July or August of 1981, Dr. Cuadra explained. Dr. Cuadra presented a brief explanation of the awarding of the contract. The question of a possible conflict of interest was raised. Mr. Ambach stated, "When I became a Member of this Commission, I signed certain oaths with respect to conflict of interest; I presume that every Member of this Commission did. I presume that the issue of whether the conduct of any Member of this Commission is a matter of conflict of interest, is a matter for that Member to determine. This body has no part, at all, in even discussion, judgment of its Membership, implicitly or explicitly. If there are, in fact, questions that are posed to Members of the Commission with respect to the proprietary of this particular contract, it seems to me that they are referred very directly to the individual who is involved, and that is it."

Mr. Keppel urged, as part of the Commission's major responsibility, legislative tracking. Dr. Bearman responded that this is being done at present and asked the Members for advice on how well they want to be kept informed.

Mr. Robert Willard, Vice President on Government Relations, Information Industry Association, cited two new bills which should be of interest:

- (1) HR 6410--Paperwork Reduction (P.L. 91-511). The bill does more than focus on paperwork reduction. It establishes statutorily an Office of Information and Regulation Affairs. It requires each Federal agency to appoint a senior-level manager who will report directly to the head of the agency. This manager is responsible for all of the information activities within that agency. The bill, itself, will provide a framework on which the next level of policy determination will rest, that is, the regulations which the Office of Management and Budget and this new office develop, Mr. Willard explained; and
- (2) HR 8443--International Communications, which establishes an International Council on Communications and Information.

Mr. Keppel urged that the Commission be concerned with how solid the research base is, nationally. He also pointed out that, in this Message, the President is linking libraries with a lot of Federal programs which have specific social goals. The obvious issue before this Commission is how much do we want to get involved in this issue.

Mr. Benton noted that the Commission, as a whole, should begin to confront the contents of the White House Conference Final Report. We need, for the first time, to talk about content and priorities. We are a small organization with a limited staff and limited resources, and we must address what we are going to do as a Commission. Perhaps the major issues, as outlined by Mr. Keppel, could be useful input to the Futures/Planning Committee's discussion, Mr. Benton suggested.

Col. Aines, when asked his advice, said he felt the Commission should be especially concerned and aware of: (1) the "Brown Bill" establishing a new Institute, and what Mr. Brown does over the next couple of months; (2) the National Telecommunications and Information Agency and the new leadership it will have; (3) the new Science Advisor to the President and the role which he intends to play in the information area; (4) what the Chairman (Louis M. Branscomb) of the National Science Foundation's Board intends to do; (5) What happens to all the old-line outfits, like the Federal Communications Commission, during this period? How will each major agency strengthen its own information process? You can take a reactive attitude (wait and see), or a proactive attitude to try and implement, Col. Aines stated.

#### NCLIS Budget Request (in Response to President's Message)

Mr. Benton reported that the three senior members of the staff met with the Office of Management and Budget in early October to discuss NCLIS' budget in response to the President's Message delivered to Congress on September 26, 1980. It was an encouraging meeting--one of the first in a long, long time, Mr. Benton added. A major supplemental was requested by NCLIS, which was turned down. An appeal was submitted, and the end result is that we did receive a substantially-lesser amount than originally requested. The Executive Committee was involved in this process, Mr. Benton noted.

The specific facts of this request and appeal are detailed in Commission Documents #80-95 and #80-107.

Mr. Benton acknowledged Col. Aines' insight and enthusiasm for requesting the supplemental based on the President's Message.

#### Reagan Transition Team

Mrs. Reszetar informed the Members that she and Dr. Bearman had met with members of the Reagan Transition Team. Mrs. Reszetar stated, "The Transition Team people are very thorough, and they ask very good questions." Mrs. Dorshak, Education Transition Team, informed Mrs. Reszetar that she will be recommending that there be a permanent liaison between the Department of Education and the Commission. At this point, Mrs. Reszetar reported, the Transition Team members say they are only collecting facts and not making policy; however, their recommendations will be listened to, Mrs. Reszetar observed.

An Education Policy Task Force, chaired by Mr. W. Glen Campbell, Director of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, has been established, it was reported.

Dr. Bearman added that she, too, was pleased with the meetings between the staff and the Transition Team. There was a good deal of preparation for these meetings, and the Transition Team people came away understanding, pretty well, what the Commission has done in the past, Dr. Bearman stated.

Mr. Benton urged the Members to read the letter which he wrote to Vice President-Elect Bush (contained in the meeting packet). He stated that within ten days of sending this letter, he received a call from a member of the Transition Team (Mr. Beamis) who reported that Mr. Bush was glad to have received the letter and that a follow-up letter should be written after January 20 stating the programs and projects NCLIS sees as most pertinent and pressing in terms of priority.

#### NCLIS/OMB Luncheon Meeting

Mr. Benton reported that an important luncheon was held on December 10 with James Tozzi, Ken Allen and John McNicholas of the Office of Management and Budget, Robert Hayes, Chair, Public/Private Sector Task Force; Patricia Berger, National Bureau of Standards, Andrew A. Aines, Former NCLIS Member, Bessie B. Moore, NCLIS Vice Chairman, Toni Carbo Bearman, Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar, and himself, which happened to be held immediately after the President signed the Paperwork Reduction Act. The reason for the meeting was that Robert Hayes was in town, and we wanted to offer the services of the Commission and the Public/Private Sector Task Force to OMB in its struggle with the problem of the management and distribution of government information, Mr. Benton stated.

At the conclusion of the luncheon, Mr. Tozzi asked for NCLIS' help--Dr. Bearman's specifically--in sifting out the responses to OMB's Circular A - Improved Management and Dissemination of Federal Information, and on the list of 15 issues which need further research and are listed as a part of HR 6410. The results of this will be helpful to both the Public/Private Sector Task Force and to the Commission in its deliberations, Mr. Benton concluded.

#### NCLIS Programs and Projects

Mr. Ambach presented his observations in an attempt to make a connection among points of budget, legislation, administration, transition, long- and short-term goals and strategies, etc., and to place them in a first-things-first order:

- (1) Legislation--In regard to the issue of Congressional change, I think there must be an identification, as Col. Aines has noted, of all of the right pressure points where the changes are likely to be made in staffing and who is likely to surface to make key decisions. I think this task must be done by the staff and Chairman, and perhaps some Commissioners could be involved from time to time. The work with the Transition Team is especially important, and the questions imposed

ACTION

by them must be considered beforehand, Mr. Ambach cautioned. If the Transition Team were to ask, "What contribution do you expect to make within the next four years to this Nation?" or, "What do you do that is unique that nobody else can do?" what would we say? What can we do to assist the staff and the Chairman in these dealings?" he asked.

- (2) "The three key unique aspects of this Commission, to me, are: (1) we have a broad perspective to now look at the present legislation and advise; (2) with regard to advice to other agencies, we have a unique capacity to be able to advise organizations at the Federal level dealing with information policy; (3) the issue of Federal agencies providing information to the public, i.e., dissemination of information at the Federal level; and (4) special projects--new technology-type studies. e.g., literacy. Other agencies are already doing this; what is the Commission's relationship?"
- (3) "What is the 'meat and potatoes' of the core activities which the Commission should be focusing on?" Mr. Ambach asked.

Mr. Alpers reminded Mr. Ambach that the Commission has made program commitments for 1981. Dr. Cuadra then asked if there were any items committed which could be de-committed. Dr. Bearman stated, "We do have some flexibility, even in the short-range. We also have flexibility because we can accept contributions, and we have a Finance/Fund Raising Committee. I hope the Commission will talk about what it wants to do, and we can look at the broader goals and can then turn it over to our Finance/Fund Raising Committee."

"The process by which we can fulfill the dream and reality, as laid out by Mr. Ambach, must be determined. This is survival time," Mr. Benton urged.

Mrs. Moore reminded the Members that charges for Standing Committees have not, as yet, been written. Mr. Alpers stated that the Futures/Planning Committee should think of not only where we are today, but keep us on track for the future.

Dr. Bearman suggested that the Futures/Planning Committee consider Mr. Ambach's observations, discuss them during the evening meeting, and again, perhaps, by telephone, so that by the April 1981 NCLIS meeting a tight, well laid-out plan will be available.

Col. Aines suggested that the Commission consider just how much recognition the departing President's Message will have in the year 1981. "When you talk about your future plans, you should look into this reality," Col. Aines urged.

Mr. Benton reinforced Col. Aines' statement, pointing out that the President's Message is the result of a struggle by the Interagency Task Force, some of whom will stay in their present positions. "We need to look at the value of those ideas, for their own sake, which is not what we are doing in an open and serious way. We need to get on with prioritizing our program needs," Mr. Benton said.

Mrs. Reszetar then reported that one of the Transition Team persons was confused about the White House Conference report and how the Commission related to it. At first she thought that the report was the Commission's report and was endorsed by the Commission. Mrs. Reszetar informed her that it was not the Commission's report and, in fact, the Commission had not yet reviewed all of the recommendations. The Transition Team person said she was pleased to hear that statement because there were some very politically-sensitive issues which have to be addressed.

Col. Aines urged the Commission to be prepared for a request from the Administration to advise them on how we would suggest a 20% cut across-the-board on all library and information programs in the Federal Government. "This would not be an unusual request with a new Administration," Col. Aines stated. If this should happen, what are you going to say" This is not beyond the realm of reality. "It is these unexpected things that can dictate what you will be doing over the next four years," he said.

Dr. Cuadra agreed with Col. Aines' statement, adding, "We have to be mentally prepared for such requests, and we should have Commission money earmarked and should have Commissioners and staff who have the competence and time to respond. Mr. Sprague urged flexibility within the budget and staff. "Our existence depends upon flexibility to respond to new signals which the new Administration will ask us to respond to," Mr. Sprague stated.

In making his closing remarks for the day, Mr. Benton stated, "This evening is the first meeting of our new Standing Committees. The first thing to do is to discuss their general charge. We are now with new leadership and new committee structure, and about to launch off on new Commission activities, procedures, and programs."

Saturday, December 13, 1980

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

#### Futures/Planning Committee Report

The Futures/Planning Committee met the prior evening and reviewed the "observations" as outlined by Mr. Ambach, Dr. Cuadra reported. The Committee did determine that it is not possible to advise or react to everything which comes into view--there are neither the staff, technical competence, nor funds available; we must be selective. Dr. Cuadra pointed out that NCLIS can be of help to other Federal agencies reacting to legislation and/or plans because of our capability to call conferences and to hire consultants. "We must advise and assist on a selective basis where our available time and expertise permits us to do so," he stated.

The Committee decided that in order for the Commission to function as advisors there must be staff that does very high-quality legislative tracking, providing a detailed legislative analysis. These persons' primary qualifications would be keen analytical minds, ability to synthesize and present information, and they must be able to help the Members understand very complex issues. It was also agreed that more competence on the staff is needed in the area of technology so that, when we do advise and assist, we know what is technically possible. This competence must be at the staff level, Dr. Cuadra pointed out, because Commissioners' terms expire. The Futures/Planning Committee suggested that the Personnel Committee consider these recommendations.

The Committee further agreed that NCLIS should not be a lobby representing specific constituencies and that special care be taken when working with groups which are labeled as lobbys. Mr. Burns reported that the Committee could not agree on a definition for "lobbying," and suggested that this be a future agenda item. Mrs. Holahan added that everyone has a different idea of what "lobbying" means. It was agreed that NCLIS can "advise" on NCLIS matters, however.

Dr. Bearman added that the Committee did focus specifically on the projects outlined in the supplemental request to OMB: The Importance of Libraries; Government Information Depository Libraries; Federal Information Centers in Libraries; The Needs of the Disadvantaged; and The New Information and Communications Technologies. The Committee compared these programs to Mr. Ambach's "observations."

In discussing a plan for the future, Dr. Cuadra reported that members of the Committee recommended several plans, ranging from an immediate short-range plan to a three-year plan. The Committee felt that considerable staff work will be required on the plan--particularly Dr. Bearman's, and Dr. Cuadra will work closely with Dr. Bearman between now and the April meeting to draft an "assemblage" of an initial plan which could be presented at the April meeting.

#### Finance/Fund Raising Committee Report

Mr. Sprague, Chair of the Finance/Fund Raising Committee, reported on the Committee's deliberations the previous evening.

It was reported that the Committee determined that funding for the International Cooperation Project must come from outside sources, and not from NCLIS funds. Mr. Welsh raised the point that the Program Committee had not had an opportunity to address this issue, and that he felt it was that Committee's responsibility to make the recommendation to the full Commission and then to the Finance Committee. "We have not considered any of the task forces yet; we are trying to look at the general principles," Mr. Welsh stated. Mr. Benton added that there must be coordination, and this matter must be discussed. "We had a governance document, which is no longer in effect. In essence, we have to write another governance document," Mr. Benton stated.

Mr. Sprague asked, "If we have an approved project, without funding, is it agreeable that outside funding be sought for that project?" Mrs. Naftalin responded that she would prefer interaction among the Members before such a decision was made to seek outside funding. No decision on this matter was made, and it was decided that further discussion was necessary.

As another fund raising idea, for the Commission's consideration, Mr. Sprague offered, personally, to attempt to seek funds to cover the expenses of an employee doing day-to-day work. There was no objection on the part of the Commissioners to Mr. Sprague's offer of assistance.

Mrs. Warden stated that the Library and Postal Services Ad Hoc Committee would not need NCLIS funds at this time to carry on their work. Mr. Benton urged that the Commission be prepared for "targets of opportunity" which should be accounted for in the budget. Mr. Welsh stated that the staff must anticipate, with the change in Administration, that total absorption of the pay raise is likely when preparing the budget. He further suggested that the Commission consider directing the Futures/Planning Committee to begin their tasks with the 1982 budget; however, Mr. Price stated that budgets are prepared in advance, and that this could prove to be a serious problem.

Mr. Sprague reported that he and Dr. Bearman agreed that, as soon as possible, the NCLIS budget should be costed-out by project, i.e., divide overall expenses by project, which has not been done in the past, and which could be very helpful in the future.

Mr. Sprague then turned to displayed sheets of NCLIS projects and funds for 1980-81 and 1981-82, as determined at the NCLIS retreat and alternative projects depending on amount of supplemental received. Dr. Bearman requested each Commissioner to inform her of what they would like to see accomplished within the next fiscal year. "Tell me what you want to do, and then it is up to me to implement those tasks," she said. Mr. Ambach stated that it would be extremely helpful if between now and the April meeting the Members could describe where we are in the sense of a program.

In summary, Mr. Ambach recommended that--if there is no pay supplemental--the staff commit resources to: (1) hire Research Associate; (2) hire expert on new technology for library and information services; and (3) cover pay supplemental.

Mr. Benton stated that NCLIS needs to reconsider and analyze our budget and finance presentation process. We need to determine where we are now!

#### Legislative/Public Awareness Committee Report

The Legislative/Public Awareness Committee recommended and moved:

- (1) That the Commission be on record as intending to advance to the President and Congress in 1981, a National Library and Information Services Act. Such an Act would be based on, but not limited to,

recommendations of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services and recommendations in other proposed acts as set forth in the compilation of Federal legislative proposals used at the WHCLIS Ad Hoc Committee meeting, September 15-17, 1980; and

- (2) That to assist the Commission in preparing its proposed Act, the Commission would initiate a process to convene representatives of the appropriate national organizations and associations to:
  - (A) review the proposals in the document referred to in (1) above;
  - (B) identify those proposals having common support among the organizations and associations for inclusion in such an Act;
  - (C) identify those proposals which cause a division of support among the organizations and associations;
  - (D) establish priorities among the different proposals which might be included in such an Act; and
  - (E) attempt to develop a proposed Act which would be supported by the organizations, associations and Commission; and
- (3) That the process under point (2) above commence immediately with planning for the first convention of representatives to occur as early as possible in January 1981; and,
- (4) That the procedures for implementation of points (1) and (2) above, including participation of Commission Members and the Legislative Committee and assignments to Commission staff, be prepared by the Commission staff and approved by the Chairman of the Commission after consultation with the Chair of the Legislative Committee; and,
- (5) That the target date for Commission action to advance such an Act to the President and the Congress be April 1981; and
- (6) That on completion of the steps in points (1) through (5) above, the Commission would join with the organizations and associations supporting the proposed Act to develop broad public awareness of the proposed Act and build support for enactment.

#### Other Proposed Legislative Committee Actions:

- (1) Review the "Brown" Bill re Information Institute re (A) proposed changes in text; and (B) role for NCLIS.
- (2) Re "Paperwork Legislation" - P.L. 96-511 - Assign task to staff and Committee re Advice to OMB re Statute.
- (3) Recommend to Chairman of Commission that the Commission or other Committees of the Commission review and react to the "other" resolutions of the WHCLIS, just as the Legislative Committee proposes that the resolutions including Federal legislative proposals be reviewed in Commission action to advance a National Library and Information Services Act.



Mrs. Moore stated, "It seems to me that it is most unwise for this Commission to attach itself to a particular bill. We may encourage a Senator to introduce a bill, but for us to take the responsibility, I do not see as our role. We need to sit and wait a little while; it is too fast, too soon. We don't know what the reaction of the Reagan Administration will be. We said that when the bill is presented, we would assist in setting up hearings all over the country. I think it is badly timed, and I think it is out of order. I oppose it.

Mrs. Holahan stated that she feels that NCLIS should take the position now, and offer the opportunity for all of the various people involved in putting together a National Library Act to come together under our auspices to iron out difficulties before presentation to Congress. "In addition," Mrs. Holahan pointed out, "we have the added responsibility of doing something with the White House Conference resolutions, some of which will be embodied in the new Act. Thus, we will be carrying out two responsibilities by offering this forum. The end result is that we are advising Congress." Mr. Price added that we have received a request from Congress to help them in holding regional hearings on the National Library and Information Services Act. He added that money for this is not in the budget, and that he assumed it could possibly come from Congress.

Mr. Benton then reported on recent meetings with Senator Pell and Congressmen Ford, Brademas, and Simon. Senator Pell expressed his interest in continuing to work with the Commission and, in particular, conducting the regional hearings. Mr. Ford stated, "One way or another, I want to continue to be helpful and involved, and I am looking forward to working with the Senate on the regional hearings," Mr. Benton said.

Mrs. Naftalin stated that she feels it is essential that the Commission prepare its own analysis before other people and groups are asked their opinion. Mr. Benton agreed with Mrs. Naftalin and added, "We must know our position on this legislation, especially if we are asked by Congress." Mr. Ambach pointed out that the resolution, as presented by the Legislative Committee, does include the proposition that the Commission will be "advancing" a proposed act; it states that there is an "intention" to move forward to propose an act. Perhaps March, as suggested, is too soon and April may be a better time table, Mr. Ambach said.

Dr. Bearman stated that she has the same concern as Mrs. Moore and that this may prove to be a "Pandora's Box." She reminded the Commission of what they went through with the National Periodicals System and stated, "I am in favor of waiting and seeing what legislation is introduced, of holding the hearings, and of making sure that those hearings have the representation of the entire community." Dr. Bearman agreed with Miss Eileen Cooke's statement that the "Javits" Bill may be reintroduced.

Mrs. Holahan asked the question, "When the need is perceived, do we do it, or not do it, based on whether it should be done or whether we can survive in the process. Do we see the Commission as having a responsibility in this instance, or not?"

Mr. Welsh reported that a joint committee has been appointed by the Association of Research Libraries and the Center for Research Libraries, and they are going ahead with legislation regarding the National Periodicals System. "Are we prepared to react to the legislation they will submit? I think the Committee ought to focus on this," Mr. Welsh said.

Mr. Alpers asked, "What should the Legislative Committee do? What is the function of this Committee? What should the Commission do? Should we be initiators, advisors, or facilitators? Just what is the function of this body?" Dr. Tate urged that the charges for each Standing Committee be finalized, hopefully, by the end of the April 1981 meeting.

Mrs. Moore stated that, to her understanding, NCLIS cannot draft any legislation without the clearance of the Office of Management and Budget. Mrs. Reszetar agreed that there is a regulation which states that agencies cannot promote, or have legislation drafted or introduced, without OMB's clearance; it is an OMB directive. Mr. Ambach disagreed, and said according to the Public Law establishing the Commission, it does not make this statement. [Note: In a memorandum, dated 15 January 1981, in response to a request from Mrs. Reszetar for clarification on this issue, the Department of Justice stated, "We conclude that the Commission must submit all proposed legislation to OMB for clearance." See Commission Document #81-4 for complete details.]

For purposes of clarifying the meaning of the Legislative Committee's resolution, it was suggested that the word, "specification" be inserted where it read "legislation." This seemed to lift the technicality of whether or not NCLIS can draft legislation.

Dr. Bearman expressed her opinion that this would be a monumental task, almost impossible with existing funds and staff. Mr. Ambach replied, "We can only guess what the new Administration will want to do. If our task is to try to help guide the Congress and the President with regard to long-term library and information services, I cannot find a better place to start. I know it's a big job. If we cannot, what is the explanation for our role?"

There were several comments about the time frame as set forth in the resolution. Messrs. Benton, Burns, and Keppel, in particular, saw this as a problem, and it was agreed to change the wording to read, "That the target date for Commission action to advance such specifications to the President and the Congress be June 1981."

The following represents the final wording of the motion:

- (1) That the Commission be on record as intending to advance to the President and Congress in 1981, specifications for legislation on library and information services. Such specifications would be based on, but not limited to, recommendations of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services and recommendations in other proposed acts as set forth in the compilation of Federal legislative proposals used at the White House Conference on Library and Information Services Ad Hoc Committee meeting, September 15-17, 1980; and
- (2) That to assist the Commission in preparing its proposed specifications, the Commission would initiate a process to convene representatives of the appropriate national organizations and associations to: (a) review the proposals in the document referred to in (1) above; (b) identify those proposals having common support among the organizations and associations for inclusion in such specifications; (c) identify those proposals which cause a division of support among the organizations and associations; (d) establish priorities among the different proposals which might be included in such specifications; and (e) attempt to develop proposed specifications which would be supported by the organizations, associations, and Commission; and,
- (3) That the process under point (2) above commence immediately with planning for the first convention of representatives to occur as early as possible; and
- (4) That the procedures for implementation of points (1) and (2) above, including participation of Commission Members and the Legislative Committee and assignments to Commission staff, be prepared by the Commission staff and approved by the Chairman of the Commission after consultation with the Chair of the Legislative Committee; and,
- (5) That the target date for Commission action to advance such specifications to the President and the Congress be June 1981; and
- (6) That on completion of the steps in points (1) through (5) above, the Commission would join with the organizations and associations supporting the proposed specifications to develop broad public awareness of the proposed specifications and build support for enactment.

Note: There were no changes in the wording of the three (3) "Other Proposed Legislative Committee Actions" as cited on page 11.

It was MOVED by Helmut Alpers, seconded by Robert Burns, Jr., to table the motion proposed by the Legislative/Public Awareness Committee. In favor, five (5); opposed, eight (8).

It was then MOVED by Margaret Warden, seconded by Francis Keppel, that the Commission accept the resolution of the Legislative/Public Awareness Committee, as reworded. In favor, seven (7); opposed, six (6); abstained, one (1), with the Chairman voting to break the tie.

As one means of accomplishing the task, as outlined by the Legislative/Awareness Committee, Dr. Bearman suggested the possibility of working together with the Congressional Research Service. Mr. Benton agreed, and further suggested that we would take this matter up with the proper persons in the Congress.

Dr. Bearman urged the Members to prioritize programs. Because of the tight time schedule, the Commission agreed that the Executive Committee and staff would have responsibility for prioritizing programs based on available NCLIS staff and funds between the December 1980 and April 1981 meetings of the Commission.

#### NCLIS/SLA Task Force on the Role of the Special Library in Nationwide Networks and Cooperative Programs

Mr. Alpers reported that, as yet, a final mission statement has not been decided upon and that Patricia Berger, Chairman of the Task Force, is re-working the statement. Five groups were organized during their first meeting, and another meeting is planned for January 14 and 15, 1981. The task force is trying to find ways to eliminate, or at least minimize, barriers to special library participation in networking and is encouraging the participation of special libraries in networking and other cooperative activities so that the Nation, as a whole, can have access to their valuable resources.

#### Committee of 118

Mrs. Naftalin presented a summary report of the Committee of 118's activities to date. The Steering Committee has held one meeting by conference call. A meeting of the nine-member Steering Committee is scheduled during the ALA Mid-Winter Conference in late January. The Committee is in the process of considering an analysis of the resolutions, as presented on the work sheets during the September meeting. A newsletter is planned, and the group is considering an invitation from the Michigan White House Conference delegates to hold a full meeting in Detroit in 1981. The Committee is seeking funding. One suggestion emanating from the group is that each Commissioner review, evaluate, and comment on the 64 work sheets which came out of the September meeting. The staff could then compile them and distribute at the NCLIS meeting in April.

Mrs. Naftalin urged Commission discussion of the resolutions and recommendations which came from the White House Conference delegates. Mr. Benton thought the suggestion to evaluate the work sheets was excellent as this process would help us to "come to grips with our program." It was felt that the staff would review the recommendations and advise the Commission on what they feel is the most productive way to address this problem.

## Improving Library/Information Services to Cultural Minorities Task Force Report

Dr. Tate reported on the first meeting of the Task Force on Improving Library/Information Services to Cultural Minorities held in Washington, D.C., on November 6 and 7, 1980.

The task force was appointed because of the Commission's long-term interest and concern in this area. The White House Conference on Library and Information Services (WHCLIS) also highlighted the importance of provisions of library/information services and resources to all Americans. Many of the WHCLIS resolutions were related to the needs of the unserved, isolated and socially and economically disadvantaged citizens of the United States. Among these concerns were literacy, the need for bilingual materials, the maintenance of cultural heritage, and adult education.

Chairman Benton and Commissioners Gross and Tate met with the task force to review its charge and offer the support of the Commission. Chairman Benton especially felt that there should be a close working relationship between task force and the Commission's Community Information and Referral Services Task Force (CI&R). Ms. Jean E. Coleman of Chicago was appointed as the liaison from the Cultural Minorities Task Force to the CI&R.

Chairman Benton affirmed that the emphasis of NCLIS and the WHCLIS on networking and resource sharing includes the requirements that all Americans "can plug into these national library systems whatever their level of education and sophistication."

Mr. E. J. Josey of Atlanta was appointed Chair of the Task Force. Chairman Josey appointed Ms. Eleanor Hinton Hoytt as Rapporteur.

The task force has taken as its goal the "improvement of library and information services for cultural minorities, focusing on American Indians, Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics." Specific objectives, a policy statement and recommendations will be developed over the two-year life of the task force through a program of deliberations, hearings, and other strategies.

Two important motions were accepted:

### (A) Motion on Inclusion of Minority Groups:

The Cultural Minority Task Force of NCLIS "concentrates its work on the needs, the lacks, the required opportunities of access to information resources of all kinds at all levels for the four minority groups: the Asians, the American Indians, the Blacks, and the Hispanics, and that this constitute the core of the work of the task force and from the study and discussion of the needs of these groups that we prepare a report and recommendations.

## (B) Motion Related to the WHCLIS Resolutions not Passed:

"Since the WHCLIS was unable to consider the resolutions concerning the establishment of the Hispanic Office within the National Library Agency and the resolution on the needs of Ethnic groups, the Cultural Minorities Task Force has considered and endorses the resolutions and recommends to NCLIS that it support the inclusion of the resolution in the proposed enabling legislation (National Library and Information Services Act)."

Actions and discussion during the Cultural Minorities Task Force Meeting held November 6 and 7, 1980, is summarized below:

- To clarify the definition of "cultural minorities," a motion was unanimously accepted which identified four minority groups to be the focus of consideration by the task force: American Indians, Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics.
- Decided that the term, Hispanics, is to be used for Spanish-speaking minorities.
- Subcommittee on Purpose was appointed to review the purpose statement as given to the task force.
- Subcommittee was appointed to consider what actions can be taken to implement the WHCLIS resolutions concerning minority needs.
- Decided to study the National Library and Information Services Act to determine if, and to what extent, minorities are considered and to make recommendations for inclusion of minority concerns.
- Establish contact with the Committee of 118 in the implementation of the WHCLIS resolutions dealing specifically with minority needs.
- Decided to consider the "Life Long Learning Goal" resolution which was not passed to determine if it could be included in the National Library and Information Services Act.
- Ms. Jean Coleman was appointed as a liaison with the CI&R Task Force.
- Discussed the need to know what is going on in the field and what outstanding library programs exist, and the accomplishment of the tasks outlined for the first meeting.
- Asked to consider what the task force is to achieve and what strategies are to be employed to achieve desired outcomes for discussion at next meeting.
- The two subcommittees will meet at ALA midwinter meeting in February to develop plan of action for consideration at next meeting.

- Next meeting is scheduled for March 6 and 7, 1981.
- Suggested hearings be held at ALA Annual Meeting in San Francisco in June, 1981, to make contact with ALA and to allow participation by librarians.
- Mr. E. J. Josey appointed Chair; Ms. Eleanor Hinton Hoytt, Rapporteur.

#### Subcommittee Reports and Recommendations:

##### (A) Subcommittee on Purpose Statement:

The following goal and objectives of the task force were approved at this first meeting, and a follow-up report which would expand and provide substance to each objective is to be made at the next meeting. These objectives were intended to be action oriented which could give credibility to NCLIS in minority communities.

Goal: To improve library and information services for cultural minorities, focusing on American Indians, Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics.

##### Objectives:

- (1) Recommend action by NCLIS to take on library and information issues of importance to ethnic minorities:
  - a. Recruitment into library schools
  - b. Funding for local ethnic programs
  - c. Library school courses in ethnic services
  - d. Ethnic candidates for administrative positions nationwide
  - e. Management training programs
  - f. Literacy programs
  - g. Bilingual materials
  - h. Ethnic collection development
  - i. Information and referral programs
- (2) In accordance with the functions of NCLIS, as stated in P.L. 91-345, Sec. 5(a): 2, 3, and 6, the Cultural Minorities Task Force facilitate the funding and implementation of proposals through our activities, linkages and influences.

##### (B) Subcommittee on WHCLIS Resolutions:

The report from the Subcommittee suggested that the resolutions, as published, should not be altered, yet two recommendations, as listed below, were made relating to the National Library and Information Services Act. A motion was also approved due to the concern of the task force about the WHCLIS resolutions not passed.

- (1) That the task force compare the resolutions passed by WHCLIS dealing with cultural and ethnic minorities to the issue addressed in the National Library and Information Services Act and make recommendations for modifying the act to encompass these resolutions as necessary.
- (2) That the task force incorporate in its recommendations for modifying the act those resolutions dealing with cultural and ethnic minorities proposed but not passed by WHCLIS.

To Dr. Tate's report, Mrs. Gross added that the task force saw funding for local ethnic programs as a priority. "In order to have credibility with their groups, they had to have funding for their local ethnic programs," they said. This direct funding had to happen, they felt, otherwise they would be embarrassed and, in certain cases, they would not be willing to be a part of this task force. It was their feeling that NCLIS could enable this funding to happen.

#### Community Information and Referral Task Force

Mrs. Jones stated that she would present her Community Information and Referral Report in writing, since there was no action required.

#### Motion to Approve Committee/Task Force Reports

It was MOVED by Robert Burns, Jr., and severally seconded, that the Commission accept the reports, as presented by the Committee and Task Force Chairmen, of the Committee of 118; the Role of the Special Library in Nationwide Networks and Cooperative Programs; and Improving Library/Information Services to Cultural Minorities, and the NCLIS Standing Committees. Passed unanimously.

#### Executive Director's Comments

Dr. Bearman reported that she has now been on board for three weeks and has been working directly with the staff. Briefing material assembled by the staff has been a tremendous help in bringing her up to date, she said. At this point, she said, contact has been made with the Association of American Publishers, American Library Association, Association of Research Libraries, American Society for Information Science, Council on Library Resources, Inc., Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, Information Industry Association, National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services, Society for Scholarly Publishing, etc. She has attended a meeting of the Board of the District of Columbia Public Library (held at the Martin Luther King Memorial Library), talked with individuals, such as Andy Aines, Bob Chartrand, and Members of the Legislative Staff. She also met with Eileen Cooke (ALA), and Bob Willard and Paul Zurkowski (IIA) to discuss recent legislative issues. Weekly staff meetings have been held. Dr. Bearman informed the Members that she is interested in setting up a model library/information center, to enable better information and communication within the office. Alternative ways of communicating with the Commissioners and societies are being studied, and the NCLIS Newsletter will be established.



Meetings have been held with officials from the Office of Personnel Management to implement the new regulations of the Civil Service Reform Act with representatives from the Office of Management and Budget and the Reagan Transition Team. Also, she reported, she attended a meeting at Harvard on Computers in Education, where she also attended a dinner with the head librarian and a group of research librarians.

#### Closing Remarks

In his closing remarks, the Chairman stated, "This has been an historical meeting. We now have one organization. The content decisions over the last 1-1/2 days have been to support strongly the Public/Private Sector Task Force, the government information specifications and working in close collaboration with the Office of Management and Budget, and a legislative framework.

I look forward to working with Toni and the staff. If anybody can meet this challenge, Toni Carbo Bearman can. I cannot think of a person who has a better chance of meeting this challenge."

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.